

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

APPLICANTS' INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The undersigned appreciates the Examiner speaking with him on Tuesday, May 5, 2009. The claim amendments were discussed relative to the cited references, but no definite agreement was reached.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The undersigned is resubmitting the previously submitted IDS with a date of "believed to be prior to February 27, 2004", which is believed to satisfy the objection to the lack of a submitted date. This same language is used for the other non-patent documents that did not have a publication date given therefore. It is believed that this wording removes this ground for objection and reconsideration, entry of the IDS in question is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 12-14, 17, 21-29, 30-33 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroti et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0018700) in view of Ennis et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,356,529). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially it will be noted that independent claim 1 has been amended to more fully recite the capabilities of the publisher/subscriber architecture. For the Examiner's convenience, claim 1 is recited below in full:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of communicating information between heterogenous systems, the method comprising:
at least one of:
providing a publisher/subscriber architecture having a subscription manager for generating a subscription and acting as a subscriber on a first network, including a publisher/subscriber architecture for an entity on a second network, accepting a first information from the first network according to the subscription;
[[and]] transmitting the first information to the entity in accordance with the subscription, [[and]]
using a publication manager of the publisher/subscriber architecture to accept [[accepting]] a second information from the entity, and to act [acting] as a publisher of the second information for the [[first]] entity to at least one remote entity; and
for at least one of the publisher and subscriber operations, using the publisher/subscriber architecture to automatically register the entity to implement one of the publishing and subscription operations without a registration action by the entity.

Independent claim 12 has been amended along somewhat similar grounds to more expressly recite the publication and subscription manager. Independent claim 1 also recites, in the last paragraph, that the publisher and subscriber operations operate to "automatically register" the entity. Independent claims 12 and 24 have each been amended to make clear that the agent acts both as a publisher and as a subscriber. It is respectfully submitted that Giroti et al. and Ennis et al. do not render independent claims 1, 12 or 24 obvious.

Giroti et al. appears to involve an integrated voice and data application delivery system 10 (Figure 2) that is coupled between an enterprise network 12 and one or more

other networks 18, 20 and 22. The system 10 apparently detects the device type that is to receive information and delivers content in a manner that the receiving device (e.g., devices 24, 26 and 28 in Figure 2) can understand and use. As the Examiner has correctly noted, there is no discussion or suggestion in Giroti et al. of incorporating any operation that resembles *“using a publication manager of the publisher/subscriber architecture”* to determine which remote entities (e.g. which of devices 24, 26 and 28) that information originating from the entity is to be published to, nor is there any discussion or suggestion of implementing an operation directed to using a “subscription manager” for generating a subscription for the entity. The subscription enables the method of claim 1 to collect and transmit information from specific selected remote networks that the entity wishes to obtain information from. Claims 1, 12 and 24 now recite both of these capabilities. It appears that Giroti et al. is only able to recognize requests from specific types of devices (i.e., devices such as Phone PDA 24, Phone 26 and PC PDA 28), and to provide information in accordance with the communications protocol being used by the specific device. This is fundamentally and far different from the presently claimed method and system. The subject matter is also able to do both subscriber/publisher simultaneously (i.e., full duplex operation).

Ennis et al. is directed to a mechanism for facilitating subscription in a publishing/subscribe communication system. More specifically, Ennis et al. appears to involve a network switch 100 that has several modules 102(1), 102(2), etc., that can be connected together to transfer information from the port of any one or more applications on one module to the port of any one or more other applications on a different module. However, Ennis et al. does not appear to involve or suggest using a subscription

manager to enable an entity to be subscribed to specified publications from a remote entity, and also enabling the entity to publish information to other select remote entities. It appears that the communication between applications in Ennis occurs within the confines of a single network switch 100. Thus, with the Ennis et al. system, the "application" 202 would appear to have to be located within the network switch 100, whereas with the presently claimed subject matter the application would typically be located at the various entities, and would be remote from one another. The various entities would also typically be communicating over different networks. There is nothing in Ennis et al. that would appear to suggest using its teachings in connection with a system such as shown in Giroti et al.

There is further nothing in either of the Giroti et al. or Ennis et al. references that would suggest "automatically" registering an entity using the publisher/subscriber architecture as recited in claim 1. In fact, with the system of Ennis et al., it appears that the subscriber must explicitly make a subscription request, which is not required with the presently claimed method and system (see column 2, lines 8-19 of Ennis et al.).

It should also be noted that the claimed subject matter also differs from the cited references in that the present application is able to use XML parsers to help parse information dynamically and is capable of inserting updates on the fly. In other words, the claimed subject matter is able to work with dynamic data that the XML schemas help with some management algorithms.

For at least the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the foregoing claims based on Giroti et al. and Ennis et al. is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 3, 4, 15 and 16 were rejected as being obvious in view of Giroti et al. and Ennis et al., and further in view of Chou et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0018796). In view of the amendments to the independent claims and the foregoing remarks concerning Ennis et al. and Giroti et al., it is believed that this rejection has been rendered moot.

Dependent claims 8, 9, 10, 18-20 and 34 were rejected as being obvious in view of Giroti et al. and Ennis et al., and further in view of Nedbal (US 7,107,574). Again, in view of the amendments to independent claims 1, 12 and 24 and the remarks presented above concerning Ennis et al. and Giroti et al., it is believed that this rejection has been rendered moot.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 5, 2009

By: Mark D. Elchuk
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/chs

14488654.1